

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

<p>Applicant's or agent's file reference see form PCT/ISA/220</p>		<p>Date of mailing (day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (page 2)</p>	
<p>International application No. PCT/DE2004/001619</p>		<p>International filing date (day/month/year) 07/22/2004</p>	
<p>Priority date (day/month/year) 10/31/2003</p>			
<p>International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC B60R21/01</p>			
<p>Applicant Robert Bosch GMBH</p>			

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- Box No. II Priority
- Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/	Authorized officer Daehnhardt, A
Facsimile No.	Telephone No.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.
PCT/DE2004/001619

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	1 - 3, 5	YES
	Claims	4	
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	1 - 3	YES
	Claims	4 - 5	
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1 - 5	YES
	Claims		

2. Citations and explanations:

see supplementary page

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.
PCT/DE2004/001619

Box No. II Priority

1. The following document has not yet been furnished:

copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rules 43bis.1 and 66.7(a)).

translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rules 43bis.1 and 66.7(b)).

Consequently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

2. This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43bis.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.

3. Additional observations, if necessary:

Daehnhardt, A

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International File No. PCT/DE2004/001619

Re.: Point V

Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1 Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: DE 100 57 916 A (ROBERT BOSCH GMBH) May 29, 2002
(2002-05-29)

D2: US-B-6 178 8201 (JUKKA LEKKALA ET AL) January 30, 2001 (2001-01-30)

2 Document D1 is considered the most proximate related art with regard to the object of Claim 1. It discloses (the references in parentheses refer to this document) a control unit for actuating passenger protection means using an electronic safety switch which, as a function of a signal of an acceleration sensor system, releases output stages independently of a processor, the processor releasing the output stages as a function of the signal.

Therefore, the object of Claim 1 differs from the known control unit in that the safety switch analyzes an integrated acceleration signal as that signal.

The object of Claim 1 is thus novel (Article 33 (2) PCT).

2.1 The object to be achieved with the present invention may thus be viewed to be an improved analysis of an acceleration signal.

The achievement of this object proposed in Claim 1 of the

EV322953435

present application is based on an inventive step (Article 33 (3) PCT) for the following reasons:

From the present related art, it is neither known nor is it suggested to provide a safety switch which analyzes an integrated acceleration signal of an acceleration sensor system.

- 2.2 Claims 2 and 3 are dependent on Claim 1 and therefore also fulfill the requirements of PCT with regard to novelty and inventive step.
- 3 The present application does not fulfill the requirements of Article 33 (1) PCT because the object of Claim 4 is not novel in terms of Article 33 (2) PCT.

Document D2 discloses (the references in parentheses refer to this document, see Figure 1) an acceleration sensor system (1) including a housing (3), an integrator being provided in the housing (3) for integrating an acceleration signal (see column 2, lines 56 through 59).

The features of Claim 4 are thus known from Document D2.

- 3.1 Dependent Claim 5 does not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any other claim to which it refers, fulfill the requirements of PCT with regard to inventive step (Article 33 (3) PCT) for the following reasons:

Dependent Claim 5 relates to a minor structural modification of the acceleration sensor system according to Claim 4 which lies within the scope of considerations obvious to those skilled in the art, particularly since the achieved advantages are easily anticipated.

Therefore, the object of Claim 5 is also not based on an inventive step.